

#### CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description

STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College

Project Number

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Chair

**Gary Wendleken** 

Phase 1 - SOQ	Date:	5/6/2021			Number of Subn	nitting Firms	: 16
			Panelist Names			TOTAL	
Firms	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller	PANEL RANKED	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	SCORE	
1 WRNS Studio	12	11	7	13	13	56	12
2 The Jones Payne Group	9	14	9	16	11	59	13
3 DLR Group	2	6	3	4	9	24	4
4 Integrus Architecture	3	9	2	1	4	19	3
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	6	12	10	15	7	50	9
6 Miller Hull Partnership	11	2	6	9	3	31	6
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	13	15	14	12	14	68	15
8 Gensler	5	16	13	7	12	53	11
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	4	3	4	3	2	16	1
10 NAC Architecture	7	5	11	14	5	42	8
11 LMN Architects	8	1	1	2	6	18	2
12 GGLO	15	7	12	8	10	52	10
13 McGranahan Architects	14	4	5	5	1	29	5
14 Mutuus Studio	16	13	15	11	16	71	16
15 Rolluda Architects	10	10	16	10	15	61	14
16 Perkins&Will	1	8	8	6	8	31	6
17							
18							
19							
20							
Phase 2 Interview	Date:	6/3/2021		ı	Number of Firms	Interviewed	4
		DANK ODDE	D OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS			

Phase 2 interview	Date:	0/3/202			number of Firms	interviewed:	4
		RANK ORDE	R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS			
Firms	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 Integrus Architecture	4	1	3	2	2	12	3
2 LMN Architects	1	2	2	3	3	11	2
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	3	1	1	1	9	1
4 DLR Group	2	4	4	4	4	18	4
5							

Jary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Cheryl Roberts

Cheryl Roberts

Garner Miller

Penny Koal

Penny Koal

Dawn Beck

Dawn Beck



**FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES** CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET Project description

### **STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline** Community College Project Number

Consensus Date 5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Chair

**Gary Wendleken** 

CRITERIA	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller	TOTAL PANEL RANK	RANK ORDER
	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	SCORES	1
1 WRNS Studio	12	11	7	13	13	56	12
2 The Jones Payne Group	9	14	9	16	11	59	13
3 DLR Group	2	6	3	4	9	24	4
4 Integrus Architecture	3	9	2	1	4	19	3
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	6	12	10	15	7	50	9
6 Miller Hull Partnership	11	2	6	9	3	31	6
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	13	15	14	12	14	68	15
8 Gensler	5	16	13	7	12	53	11
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	4	3	4	3	2	16	1
10 NAC Architecture	7	5	11	14	5	42	8
11 LMN Architects	8	1	1	2	6	18	2
12 GGLO	15	7	12	8	10	52	10
13 McGranahan Architects	14	4	5	5	1	29	5
14 Mutuus Studio	16	13	15	11	16	71	16
15 Rolluda Architects	10	10	16	10	15	61	14
16 Perkins&Will	1	8	8	6	8	31	6
17							
18							
19							
20							
COMMENTS:							

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Gary Wendleken

Cheryl Roberts

Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)

Dawn Beck

Penny Koal

Penny Koal



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline
Community College

Consensus Date

Project Number

5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

**Gary Wendleken** 

CRITERIA	Qualificati Perso		Relevent E	xperience	Past Perfo	ormance	Life Cyc Analysis E		Sustainab Exper		TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Sco	es Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	OKDEK
1 WRNS Studio	70	21	74	19	76	19	76	8	76	8	372	73.7	12
2 The Jones Payne Group	70	21	82	21	74	19	72	7	73	7	371	74.5	9
3 DLR Group	84	25	82	21	86	22	82	8	86	9	420	84.0	2
4 Integrus Architecture	82	25	80	20	84	21	82	8	84	8	412	82.2	3
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivet	a 70	21	82	21	81	20	79	8	82	8	394	77.9	6
6 Miller Hull Partnership	66	20	82	21	74	19	75	8	80	8	377	74.3	11
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	73	22	74	19	62	16	77	8	83	8	369	71.9	13
8 Gensler	72	22	82	21	83	21	76	8	82	8	395	78.7	5
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	80	24	83	21	84	21	72	7	81	8	400	81.1	4
10 NAC Architecture	80	24	72	18	82	21	70	7	80	8	384	77.5	7
11 LMN Architects	74	22	80	20	72	18	82	8	75	8	383	75.9	8
12 GGLO	72	22	68	17	70	18	80	8	74	7	364	71.5	15
13 McGranahan Architects	70	21	68	17	75	19	75	8	75	8	363	71.8	14
14 Mutuus Studio	72	22	60	15	68	17	72	7	74	7	346	68.2	16
15 Rolluda Architects	78	23	68	17	74	19	78	8	77	8	375	74.4	10
16 Perkins&Will	82	25	92	23	83	21	78	8	81	8	416	84.3	1
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:					•								

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Gary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Jun 7, 2021

Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

### STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College

Consensus Date

Project Number

Date

5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

**Penny Koal** 

CRITERIA	Qualifica Key Per		Relev Exper		Past Perf	ormance	Life Cyc Anal Exper	ysis	Sustainab Exper	•	RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	l
1 WRNS Studio	68	20	88	22	70	18	67	7	88	9	381	75.4	11
2 The Jones Payne Group	72	22	71	18	66	17	61	6	56	6	326	67.6	14
3 DLR Group	88	26	89	22	75	19	62	6	81	8	395	81.7	6
4 Integrus Architecture	70	21	80	20	88	22	78	8	88	9	404	79.6	9
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	66	20	70	18	80	20	65	7	70	7	351	70.8	12
6 Miller Hull Partnership	90	27	80	20	88	22	78	8	82	8	418	85.0	2
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	60	18	67	17	70	18	60	6	60	6	317	64.3	15
8 Gensler	60	18	62	16	68	17	66	7	66	7	322	63.7	16
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	92	28	80	20	82	21	80	8	83	8	417	84.4	3
10 NAC Architecture	85	26	81	20	85	21	77	8	85	9	413	83.2	5
11 LMN Architects	95	29	90	23	90	23	89	9	90	9	454	91.4	1
12 GGLO	77	23	81	20	88	22	80	8	77	8	403	81.1	7
13 McGranahan Architects	88	26	80	20	85	21	83	8	80	8	416	84.0	4
14 Mutuus Studio	69	21	69	17	70	18	72	7	72	7	352	69.9	13
15 Rolluda Architects	66	20	81	20	79	20	77	8	90	9	393	76.5	10
16 Perkins&Will	80	24	80	20	80	20	80	8	80	8	400	80.0	8
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:													

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Penny Koal Jun 7, 2021

Penny Koal



**CONSULTANT SELECTION** PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description

### STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline **Community College**

Consensus Date

Project Number

5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

**Cheryl Roberts** 

CRITERIA	Qualific Key Per		Rele <sup>s</sup> Exper		Past Perf	ormance	Life Cyc Anal Exper	ysis	Sustainab Exper	U	RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 WRNS Studio	80	24	75	19	75	19	75	8	80	8	385	77.0	7
2 The Jones Payne Group	75	23	80	20	75	19	75	8	70	7	375	75.8	9
3 DLR Group	90	27	85	21	80	20	75	8	70	7	400	82.8	3
4 Integrus Architecture	95	29	85	21	78	20	80	8	85	9	423	85.8	2
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	80	24	75	19	70	18	75	8	65	7	365	74.3	10
6 Miller Hull Partnership	75	23	85	21	80	20	75	8	68	7	383	78.1	6
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	80	24	75	19	65	16	60	6	60	6	340	71.0	14
8 Gensler	80	24	75	19	65	16	60	6	65	7	345	71.5	13
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	90	27	85	21	75	19	65	7	70	7	385	80.5	4
10 NAC Architecture	80	24	75	19	70	18	65	7	60	6	350	72.8	11
11 LMN Architects	95	29	95	24	80	20	75	8	80	8	425	87.8	1
12 GGLO	80	24	75	19	65	16	65	7	70	7	355	72.5	12
13 McGranahan Architects	90	27	85	21	70	18	65	7	70	7	380	79.3	5
14 Mutuus Studio	75	23	70	18	60	15	60	6	60	6	325	67.0	15
15 Rolluda Architects	70	21	60	15	50	13	60	6	60	6	300	60.5	16
16 Perkins&Will	85	26	75	19	75	19	70	7	60	6	365	76.0	8
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:													l

COMMENTS:

Cheryl Roberts

Jun 7, 2021

Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description

### STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline **Community College**

Consensus Date

Project Number

5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

**Dawn Beck** 

### This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualific Key Per		Rele Exper		Past Perf	ormance	Life Cyc Anal Exper	ysis		ole Design rience	TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Sco	es Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 WRNS Studio	80	24	60	15	60	15	60	6	60	6	320	66.0	13
2 The Jones Payne Group	40	12	40	10	40	10	60	6	60	6	240	44.0	16
3 DLR Group	90	27	90	23	70	18	80	8	90	9	420	84.0	4
4 Integrus Architecture	98	29	90	23	90	23	90	9	90	9	458	92.4	1
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivett	<b>a</b> 60	18	60	15	40	10	50	5	50	5	260	53.0	15
6 Miller Hull Partnership	80	24	75	19	80	20	60	6	50	5	345	73.8	9
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	70	21	80	20	70	18	50	5	50	5	320	68.5	12
8 Gensler	80	24	80	20	70	18	80	8	80	8	390	77.5	7
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	95	29	85	21	80	20	80	8	80	8	420	85.8	3
10 NAC Architecture	70	21	50	13	50	13	60	6	70	7	300	59.0	14
11 LMN Architects	90	27	80	20	90	23	80	8	90	9	430	86.5	2
12 GGLO	70	21	80	20	70	18	80	8	80	8	380	74.5	8
13 McGranahan Architects	80	24	90	23	80	20	80	8	80	8	410	82.5	5
14 Mutuus Studio	70	21	70	18	70	18	70	7	60	6	340	69.0	11
15 Rolluda Architects	70	21	90	23	70	18	60	6	60	6	350	73.0	10
16 Perkins&Will	85	26	80	20	80	20	80	8	70	7	395	80.5	6
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:										<del></del>			1 7

Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)

Dawn Beck

Date

Updated 03/01/02021

Jun 7, 2021



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

### STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College

Consensus Date

Project Number

5/6/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

**Garner Miller** 

CRITERIA	Qualific Key Pe		Rele Exper		Past Perfe	ormance	Life Cyc Anal Exper	ysis	Sustainab Exper	_	RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDEI
Sco	res Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 WRNS Studio	45	14	78	20	79	20	57	6	84	8	343	66.9	13
2 The Jones Payne Group	75	23	63	16	76	19	72	7	82	8	368	72.7	11
3 DLR Group	65	20	80	20	76	19	86	9	87	9	394	75.8	9
4 Integrus Architecture	89	27	91	23	78	20	83	8	85	9	426	85.8	4
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivet	ta 77	23	82	21	81	20	75	8	74	7	389	78.8	7
6 Miller Hull Partnership	92	28	90	23	79	20	85	9	95	10	441	87.9	3
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	48	14	75	19	62	16	55	6	56	6	296	59.8	14
8 Gensler	62	19	74	19	77	19	79	8	78	8	370	72.1	12
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	91	27	92	23	84	21	88	9	87	9	442	88.8	2
10 NAC Architecture	87	26	89	22	77	19	78	8	89	9	420	84.3	5
11 LMN Architects	85	26	88	22	78	20	76	8	86	9	413	83.2	6
12 <b>GGLO</b>	78	23	70	18	68	17	76	8	83	8	375	73.8	10
13 McGranahan Architects	91	27	94	24	84	21	89	9	92	9	450	89.9	1
14 Mutuus Studio	44	13	55	14	55	14	56	6	61	6	271	52.4	16
15 Rolluda Architects	52	16	57	14	58	15	54	5	63	6	284	56.1	15
16 Perkins&Will	75	23	82	21	75	19	81	8	85	9	398	78.4	8
17													
18													
19													
20													

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)

Garner Miller

Date

Jun 7, 2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

# Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College ation Project Number

Date of Evaluation

6/3/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Beco	mes Pu	blic Re	cord			Gary	Wendl	eken	
CRITERIA	Weighting	Inte	_	LMN Ar	chitects	Schreibe White	r Starling head	DLR (	Group
ONTENA	vveignting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	80	20	84	21	82	21	80	20
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project issues.	or the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	ny towords w	orking collat	ooratively wit	h clients and	d other outw	ard looking
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and what	t role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion				
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload	ad for the du	ration of the	project and	how this proj	ect fits into	the firm's ove	erall plannin	g	
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	75	15	78	16	78	16	80	16
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Fi	nalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ined basic p	roject requir	ements and	how well ha	ve they
managed development of project scope in the past.  Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to est	ablish and m	anage proje	et budgete	How succes	eful baye th	ov boon with	nast projec	te	
<u> </u>		0 1 3	Ü			,	,		
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules					1				
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	84	21	86	22	83	21	84	21
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the better understand the project and the project requirements	ney have rev	iewed availa	ble project i	nformation, a	ittended info	rmational m	lg, or done ir	ndependent	research to
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define ch	allenges and	d/or opportur			ject?	ı			
EXPERIENCE	15%	80	12	84	13	82	12	82	12
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	work the firm	has done a	nd <i>how</i> that	relates or pr	ovides guida	ance for this	project?		
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual teal	1								
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	75	6	72	6	70	6	74	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Li differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?	fe Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	aking? Are t	hey familiar	with the OFN	/I requireme	nts? Are the	·у
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	75	5	73	5	72	5	82	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for	or this project	t. How can t	he sustainal	bility strategy	s mesh with	the project	budget.		
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Y	es	Ye	es	Y	es	Y	es
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	469		477		467		482	81
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			79		82		80		81
FINAL RANK ORDER			4		1		3		2

Gary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Jun 7, 2021

Date

COMMENTS:

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES **Community College** Date of Evaluation Project Number CONSULTANT SELECTION 6/3/2021 2021-103 PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET Name of Selection Panel Member This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record Penny Koal Schreiber Starling Integrus **LMN Architects DLR Group Architecture** Whitehead **CRITERIA** Weighting Weighted Weighted Weighted Weighted Raw Score Raw Score **Raw Score** Raw Score Score Score Score Score 90 87 88 22 80 ORGANIZATION 25% 20 Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towords working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning 87 PROJECT MANAGEMENT Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team acertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past. Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs. PROJECT APPROACH 90 25%

Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements

Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?

**EXPERIENCE** 15% 85 13 80 12 88 13 80 12

Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?

Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?

 LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE
 8%
 90
 7
 80
 6
 88
 7
 78
 6

Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE 7% 90 6 82 6 90 6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget.

Not **DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN** received received received received Scored (indicate included or not included) TOTAL Raw SCORE 533 509 515 504 84 100% 89 86 84 TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE 85 **FINAL RANK ORDER** 1 4

COMMENTS:

Penny Koal	Jun 7, 2021
Penny Koal	Date

89

6

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

## Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College ation Project Number

Date of Evaluation

6/3/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

### Charyl Pohorte

This Scoresheet Beco	<u>omes Pu</u>	ıblic Re	cord			Che	ryl Rob	erts	
CRITERIA	Weighting	Archit	grus ecture	LMN Ar	chitects		r Starling ehead	DLR (	Group
ORITERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	80	20	85	21	95	24	70	18
<u>Management Plan</u> : How is the team set up to manage this project issues.	for the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	y towords w	orking collab	oratively witl	n clients and	other outwa	rd looking
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and what	role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion				
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the du	ration of the	project and	how this proj	ect fits into t	he firm's ove	rall planning		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	75	15	80	16	90	18	70	14
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F managed development of project scope in the past.	inalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ined basic p	roject require	ements and h	now well hav	e they
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to es	tablish and m	nanage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have the	ey been with	past project	S	
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well d	o they listen	to client sch	nedule needs	and then m	eet client scl	nedule need:	S.	
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	70	18	80	20	90	23	70	18
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that t better understand the project and the project requirements	hey have rev	iewed availa	ble project ir	nformation, a	ttended info	rmational mt	g, or done in	dependent r	esearch to
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define cl	nallenges and	d/or opportur	nities they se	e for the pro	ject?				
EXPERIENCE	15%	75	11	80	12	85	13	70	11
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	work the firm	has done a	nd <i>how</i> that	relates or pr	ovides guida	nce for this	project?		
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	m members l	nave experie	nce that rela	ates to the pr	oject type or	complexity?	·	ı	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	80	6	80	6	85	7	70	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	aking? Are th	hey familiar v	with the OFM	1 requiremen	its? Are they	′
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90	6	80	6	80	6	80	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate f	or this project	t. How can t	he sustainat	oility strategy	s mesh with	the project b	oudget.		
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Rece	eived	Rece	eived	Rece	eived	Rece	eived
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	470		485		525		430	71
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			76		81		89		71
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1		4
I									

Cheryl Roberts
Cheryl Roberts (Jun 7, 2021 15:00 PDT)
Cheryl Roberts

Jun 7, 2021

Date

COMMENTS:

CONSULTANT SELECTION

PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

# Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College ation Project Number

Date of Evaluation

6/3/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet E	<u>Becomes F</u>	Public F	Record			Da	awn Be	ck	
CRITERIA	Weighting	,	grus ecture	LMN Ar	chitects		r Starling ehead	DLR (	Group
CRITERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighte Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	90	23	80	20	100	25	50	13
<u>Management Plan</u> : How is the team set up to manage this prossues.	ect for the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	ny towords w	orking collab	ooratively wi	th clients and	d other outwa	ard lookir
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members	present and what	t role are the	y assuming	in the discus	ssion				
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their wo	rkload for the du	ration of the	project and	how this pro	ject fits into	the firm's ove	erall planning	g	
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90	18	80	16	100	20	70	14
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and to managed development of project scope in the past.	ne Finalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ined basic p	roject requir	ements and	how well ha	ve they
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to	o establish and m	nanage proje	ect budgets.	How succes	sful have th	ey been with	n past projec	ts	
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop sched	ules. How well d	lo they listen	to client scl	hedule needs	s and then m	neet client so	hedule need	ls.	
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	80	20	70	18	90	23	70	18
petter understand the project and the project requirements	,		. ,	,		ormational m	tg, or done ir	ndependent	research
petter understand the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to defir	e challenges and	d/or opportur	nities they se	ee for the pro	ject?			· 	
petter understand the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to defir <u>EXPERIENCE</u>	e challenges and	d/or opportur	nities they se	ee for the pro	oject?	100	15	ndependent 80	research
petter understand the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to defir  EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss p	e challenges and 15% past work the firm	d/or opportur 90 has done a	nities they se 14 nd <i>how</i> that	ee for the pro	oject? 15 rovides guid	100 ance for this	15 project?	· 	
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated the better understand the project and the project requirements  Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir  EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss projects (key team members): Do the individual LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	e challenges and 15% past work the firm	d/or opportur 90 has done a	nities they se 14 nd <i>how</i> that	ee for the pro	oject? 15 rovides guid	100 ance for this	15 project?	· 	
Detter understand the project and the project requirements  Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir  EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss properties (key team members): Do the individual  LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE  Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensing  Company of the project of the p	e challenges and 15% bast work the firm team members I	90 has done a have experie	nities they se 14 nd how that ence that relations 7	100 relates or protection at the protection at t	nject?  15 rovides guidaroject type o	100 ance for this r complexity	15 project?	80	12
Detter understand the project and the project requirements  Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir  EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss projects (key team members): Do the individual   LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE  Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehension of the individual comprehension of	e challenges and 15% bast work the firm team members I	90 has done a have experie	nities they se 14 nd how that ence that relations 7	100 relates or protection at the protection at t	nject?  15 rovides guidaroject type o	100 ance for this r complexity	15 project?	80	12
Detter understand the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss p Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individua LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehension differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?  BUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	e challenges and  15% bast work the firm team members I  8% re Life Cycle Cos	d/or opportur 90 has done a have experie 90 st exercise in	nities they se 14 nd how that release that release that release decision materials 6	ee for the product of	oject?  15 rovides guidaroject type o 7 hey familiar	100 ance for this r complexity 100 with the OFF	15 project? ? 8 M requireme	80 80 nts? Are the	12 6
Detter understand the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define the Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss provided the Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensibiliterentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?  SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriated.	e challenges and  15% bast work the firm team members I  8% re Life Cycle Cos	90 has done a have experie 90 st exercise in 80 t. How can t	nities they se 14 nd how that release that release that release decision materials 6	ee for the pro 100 relates or pro ates to the pro 90 aking? Are t	oject?  15 rovides guidaroject type o 7 hey familiar	100 ance for this r complexity 100 with the OFI 90 a the project	15 project? ? 8 M requireme	80 80 nts? Are the	12 6 ey 5
Detter understand the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss provided in the Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehension of the Company of the Relevant Past Projects (key team members):  BUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate of the Relevant Past Projects (key team members):  DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	e challenges and  15% past work the firm team members I  8% re Life Cycle Cos  7% ste for this project	90 has done a have experie 90 st exercise in 80 t. How can t	nities they se 14 nd how that ence that rel. 7 decision matching 6 the sustainal	ee for the pro 100 relates or pro ates to the pro 90 aking? Are t	oject?  15 rovides guid: roject type o 7 hey familiar 6 vs mesh with	100 ance for this r complexity 100 with the OFI 90 a the project	15 project? ? 8 M requirement	80 80 nts? Are the	12 6 ey 5
petter understand the project and the project requirements  Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to defir  EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss processes the Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual	te challenges and 15% past work the firm team members I 8% per Life Cycle Cos 7% paste for this project Not Scored	d/or opportur  90  has done a have experie  90  st exercise in  80  t. How can t	nities they se 14 nd how that ence that rel. 7 decision matching 6 the sustainal	ee for the product of	oject?  15 rovides guid: roject type o 7 hey familiar 6 vs mesh with	100 ance for this r complexity 100 with the OFF 90 a the project	15 project? ? 8 M requirement	80 80 nts? Are the	12 6 es

Dawn Beck

Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)

Dawn Beck

Jun 7, 2021

Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

# Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College ation Project Number

Date of Evaluation

6/3/2021

2021-103

Name of Selection Panel Member

#### Garner Miller

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record					Garner Miller				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	78	20	78	20	76	19	74	19
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project issues.	for the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	ny towords w	orking collal	boratively wi	th clients an	d other outw	ard looking
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and wha	t role are the	y assuming	in the discus	ssion				
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the du	ration of the	project and	how this pro	ject fits into	the firm's ov	erall plannin	g	
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	94	19	80	16	92	18	70	14
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F managed development of project scope in the past.	inalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ined basic p	roject requir	ements and	how well ha	ve they
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to es	tablish and m	nanage proje	ect budgets.	How succes	ssful have th	ey been with	n past projec	ts	
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well o	lo they listen	to client scl	nedule need:	s and then n	neet client so	chedule need	ds.	
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	88	22	86	22	92	23	74	19
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that to better understand the project and the project requirements	hey have rev	iewed availa	able project i	nformation, a	attended info	ormational m	tg, or done i	ndependent	research to
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define ch	nallenges and	d/or opportur	nities they se	ee for the pro	ject?				
EXPERIENCE	15%	84	13	84	13	78	12	80	12
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?									
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea			ence that rel		roject type o		?	ı	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	60	5	60	5	82	7	78	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Cos	st exercise in	decision ma	aking? Are t	hey familiar	with the OFI	M requireme	nts? Are the	ey .
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	78	5	74	5	80	6	80	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for	or this projec	t. How can t	the sustaina	bility strategy	s mesh with	the project	budget.		
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Received		Received		Received		Received	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	482		462		500		456	75
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			83		80		84		75
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		3		1		4

Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)

Jun 7, 2021

Date

COMMENTS:

# 2021-103-ScoreSheetSummary

Final Audit Report 2021-06-08

Created: 2021-06-07

By: Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAmrvh6Cpqh9YD-ZBoCzp6Apn4zjH6Epl5

### "2021-103-ScoreSheetSummary" History

- Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov) 2021-06-07 9:35:13 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document emailed to Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-06-07 9:39:26 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-06-07 9:39:26 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu) for signature 2021-06-07 9:39:26 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu) for signature 2021-06-07 9:39:26 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsarch.com) for signature 2021-06-07 9:39:27 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov) 2021-06-07 9:40:01 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.64.254
- Document e-signed by Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov)

  Signature Date: 2021-06-07 9:40:47 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Email viewed by Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu) 2021-06-07 9:47:34 PM GMT- IP address: 24.18.228.154
- Document e-signed by Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu)

  Signature Date: 2021-06-07 10:00:57 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 24.18.228.154
- Email viewed by Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov) 2021-06-07 10:10:46 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30



Document e-signed by Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-06-07 - 10:17:44 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

Email viewed by Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsarch.com)

2021-06-07 - 10:32:10 PM GMT- IP address: 50.251.220.66

Email viewed by Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu)

2021-06-08 - 0:00:17 AM GMT- IP address: 172.242.243.147

Document e-signed by Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-06-08 - 0:02:34 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 172.242.243.147

Document e-signed by Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsarch.com)

Signature Date: 2021-06-08 - 2:52:07 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 67.168.6.73

Agreement completed.

2021-06-08 - 2:52:07 AM GMT

